DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 039 591 CG 005 390

AUTHOR Finney, Joseph C.
TITLE A System of Computerized Reports for Counselors.
INSTITUTION American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, D.C.; Kentucky Univ., Lexington. Dept. of Educational Psychology.
PUB DATE 24 Mar 70
NOTE 8p.; Paper presented at the American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention, New Orleans, Louisiana, March 23-26, 1970
AVAILABLE FROM Dr. Joseph C. Finney, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky 40506 (No price is quoted.)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.50
DESCRIPTORS *Computer Oriented Programs, Computers, *Counseling, Counseling Centers, *Counseling Effectiveness, Counseling Services, *Counselors, *Innovation

ABSTRACT

The development of a system of computerized reports for counselors is described. New scales and measures of the basic variables of personality were derived. The data collected over the course of seven years was analyzed. Various forms of programmed reports emerged, two of which are reported in this paper. These two, one for general counselors and one for correctional counselors, are examined. An example of their possible application is given. A nationwide survey of counselors is cited as affecting the decision to add, subtract, and change certain features. The survey also shows differences in the interests of various kinds of counselors and precipitated questions regarding the appropriateness of the forms for certain of these counselors. Conclusions are discussed briefly. (TL)

A System of Computerized Reports for Counselors

Joseph C. Finney, M.D., Ph.D.
Department of Educational Psychology
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky 40506

Read at the Annual Meeting
of
The American Personnel and Guidance Association
in
New Orleans, Louisiana
March 24, 1970

While we might like to say that the system of making psychological reports by computer, to counselors, was developed on the basis of the survey of counselors, such was not the case. The system has grown and developed through many years, since 1956. The findings from the national survey of counselors affected the decision to add some features to the report, to subtract some from it, or to change the wording of others.

In 1956 the senior author first began to design plans for a programmed interpretation of psychological tests of personality. The project must begin with the development of new and better scales to measure the basic variables of personality: their basic drives or urges; and their defense mechanisms by which they cope with these drives and urges and transform them into newer and higher order motivations and strivings; their basic attitudes toward life, toward themselves and toward other people.

These basic measures, and combinations of measures, would determine the choice of statements from a repertory. Statements could be arranged in a systematic order, and combined into paragraphs, so as to describe thoroughly the sailient characteristics of each individual's unique personality, his character, and his ways of dealing with the world.

The early years of this project were devoted chiefly to deriving the new scales and measures used: first one set derived from data gathered in Illinois, from 1956 through 1959, and then another set gathered from data in Hawaii,

from 1960 through 1963. Several series of factor analyses were done, beginning in 1959 and continuing through the present, to clarify the basic dimensions which the scales were measuring. The first programmed reports were composed, not entirely by computer, in 1964.

The first reports composed were lengthy reports of the psychodynamics, intended for use by psychotherapists in mental health clinics and in private practice. A shorter psychodiagnostic version was designed for psychiatrists and clinical psychologists, and another short version for physicians and surgeons. Still another form was designed to compose reports for industrial psychologists, personnel officers, and college admission officers.

The two forms being reported today were developed with the help of research grant RD 2465 P from the Social and Rehabilitation Services, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. These two are the report for counselors in general and the report for correctional counselors, known as Type 2 and Type 3, respectively. The Type 2 or general counselors report is intended for rehabilitation counselors, school guidance counselors, social workers, caseworkers, marriage counselors, and pastoral counselors. The Type 3 reports are designed for counselors and caseworkers at correctional institutions, as well as for probation and parole officers, attorneys, and judges.

The report writing system is in principle independent of any particular psychological test. It is designed so that any test measuring much the same set of personality factors can be used as its input. This system was first applied to the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) and later to the California Psychological Inventory (CPI). Its specific application to other tests

is being developed.

Counselors working in rehabilitation settings or, in general, those working with the physically or emotionally disabled are likely to find the MMPI of greatest usefulness; while guidance counselors in high schools and, in general, those working with young normal people, usually prefer the CPI because of its greater blandness.

Now let us examine the typical case report of Type 2, the report for general counselors.

The report may be as short as a thousand words, or it may run to two thousand or more, in an unusual case.

The second half of the report consists of the job success section. This section is based in part on nine scales known, from previous studies, to measure qualities concerned with occupational success. Seven of the scales interpreted in the section were developed by Harrison Gough as part of the CPI. A scale by Finney, measuring ambition and urge for achievement, is included, and also a scale by LaPace which distinguished major league from minor league baseball players.

The sum or average of these scales gives a general predictor of the likelihood of occupational success. The differences among the various scales enable us to draw conclusions about a person's strengths and weaknesses, that may affect his success in work, and which should be taken into account in his choice of a vocation. For example, some jobs require much more conformity and conventionality than others, and this is something that can well be pointed out to a youth who shows, through his test scores, that he does not like to conform to the conventions.

The other half of the report, the first half, consists of a number of parts. The first paragraph describes test taking attitude. The second paragraph describes one's personality and character in terms of one's scores on five basic factors. Another global part gives some personality description in terms of the well known two-point code. Two other short paragraphs mention the person's dependency and his demandingness, as these may affect the relationship between client and counselor. Another paragraph describes the general hostility, and the tendency to take things out on one's self or other people.

Another short section describes the individual's ethical standards and sense of responsibility. This paragraph is somewhat expanded in the legal and correctional report, Type 3; the latter report adds some predictions of parole success and of likelihood to escape from confinement, while shortening or omitting some sections found in the general counselors reports.

Still another paragraph tells of the person's extroversion, introversion, and general social relationships.

A nationwide survey of counselors (Auvenshine et al., in preparation) showed that certain questions which might be answered from a psychological test were rated as much more important than others. The top-rated questions are listed as follows, with figures in parenthesis showing the percentage who rated each question as either very important or absolutely essential.

How able is he to view himself realistically?	(70.3%)
What motivates him? What are his goals?	(70.1%)
How do his aspirations, his achievements, and his abilities compare?	(67.7%)
How well or how badly does he view himself?	(60.1%)
How much drive, push, and aggressiveness does he have?	(55.0%)
How intelligent is he?	(52.8%)

With these questions in mind, the program was revised, with addition and deletion of some sections, and rewording of others, so as to give counselors and caseworkers the answers to questions that they had rated as most important.

The survey also showed some differences in the interests of various kinds of counselors. The differences, according to job title, were as follows.

Job title psychologist. They were interested in creativity, ability, and psychological assets. They were also interested in the risks of getting emotionally upset. They were not interested in knowing whether the client is trustworthy or selfish, nor in his capacity to resist temptation.

Job title counselor. They were interested in personal qualities making for success at work. They were interested in ability, motivation, and interpersonal relationships at work, and in how realistic or unrealistic the self-concept might be. They were not interested in mental health nor in questions of serious psychopathology.

Job title administrator (of counseling). They were interested in leadership, in competiveness, and in questions about how well a person can work. They were not interested in self-concept, nor in mental health, nor in a person's feelings, his subjective comfort or distress.

Job title social worker. They were interested in a broad spectrum of rather sophisticated questions. They were interested in a person's mental health; in his interpersonal relationships; in his responsibility and dependability; and in his feelings and his self-esteem. They were not interested in vocational interests nor in vocational abilities.

Job title probation or parole officer. They were interested in how trustworthy a person is, and in how well he can be expected to behave himself. They were not interested in self-esteem, perception of self and others, friendliness, flexibility, and predictions of success in a job or a vocation.

Because of these differences, the question arose whether the present report for counselors and caseworkers should be replaced by two different types of report, one for counselors and one for social caseworkers. So far, that has not been done. The reporting system at present tells more than the counselors want to know about emotional problems, and tells more than the social workers want to know about potentiality of work, and yet it meets the needs expressed by both groups.

Summary

The development of a system of computerized reports for counselors has been described. Several forms of report are available, each written to be read by a different category of professional colleagues. The reports for general counselors and caseworkers and correctional counselors were tailored to answer the questions that were thought important by these professional groups in a national survey.